



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IS CLASS CONFLICT IN AMERICA GROWING AND IS IT INEVITABLE?

PROFESSOR JOHN R. COMMONS
The University of Wisconsin

The present-day significance of the term "class conflict" is found in the apparent antagonism of employing and wage-earning classes. There are other interests that might be described as economic classes, but their opposition does not lead to outbreak. Their differences are compromised under forms of constitutional government. But a strike is incipient rebellion. It might go to the limit of a general stoppage of industry, as it has done in Belgium and Australia. Whether limited or general, it is the revolt of a practically unpropertied class against property rights. It is a kind of class conflict not yet obviated by our forms of government, like the contests of other classes or interests.

As nearly as I can make out from the census of the United States, of the 24,000,000 men and boys engaged in industry, 6,000,000 are farmers and tenants, 3,750,000 are farm laborers, 11,000,000 are other laborers, clerks, and servants, 1,500,000 are professional and agent classes, and 2,000,000 are other employers. There is no appreciable class conflict between farmers, tenants, and farm laborers. Over one-half of the laborers are sons of the farmers, destined to pass up into their fathers' position or out into other classes. The tenants are small contractors, interested more in prices and profits than they are in wages. The professional and agent classes are disinterested, or else interested in the classes to whom they cater. The field for a class conflict is the 11,000,000 other laborers and servants and the 2,000,000 employers.

But not all of these are in a position to provoke class feeling. In the thousands of small towns and villages the employer or the merchant and his help do the same kind of work side by side and they have close personal relations, often that of father and son,

like the farmers. The servants are individually attached to individuals of other classes. Many thousands of apparent laborers, like teamsters and peddlers, are also small capitalists. At the outside guess, not more than 6,000,000 wage-earners, and 1,500,000 employers and investors are in the field where classes are forming. Two-thirds of the voting population are spectators. We call them the public. They may be forced to take sides, but they want fair play. The outcome depends on the way they are brought in.

While therefore only one-third are available for class conflict, yet they operate fundamental industries of our civilization, like railways and coal mines, or they command strategic points, like cities, the centers of population. Their importance is greater than their numbers.

Now, it must be noted that within this third of the population enormous industrial changes are going on. These tend to intensify the class conflict, but for the time being conceal it. The principal changes are the growth of corporations on the employers' side and the division of labor on the wage-workers' side. That corporations break down the personal ties that formerly held together the employer and his men has long been recognized, but this incidental effect is insignificant compared with the direct effect of the consolidated corporations and syndicates of the past ten years. By combining several corporations into one, by operating several establishments of the same kind in different parts of the country, by placing them all on a uniform system of accounting which shows at a glance every month the minutest detail of every item of cost, the modern trust is going farther to alienate classes than did the simple corporation when it displaced the individual employer. The primitive competition of employer against employer is a children's game compared with the modern competition of manager against manager checked up every month by the cold statistics of cost. Under this system managers go down like tenpins, or up like Schwab. They "hire and fire" their employees, promote and derate their subordinates, with the precision of rapid-fire guns. Under their exact system of costs they measure a man as they do coal, iron, and kilowatts, and labor

becomes literally, what it has been by analogy, a commodity. If one be a scientist or an engineer one can but admire the marvelous results. The astounding reductions of cost, the unheard of efficiency of labor, the precise methods of scientific experiment and tests, reveal a new field of conquest of the human mind. But if one talks with the workmen at their homes one hears the grumblings of class struggle.

The system is perfected by the division of labor. Formerly a workman's efficiency consisted of two things, skill and speed. Division of labor has split up his skill into its constituent operations, and the progress of cost-keeping is carrying the analysis farther than ever before. Instead of the skill of one man we have the grading of operations among a gang of men. Skill had to be measured by quality, by intelligence, by ingenuity, versatility, and interest in his work. These human qualities are elusive and not yet measured even by modern psychology. But speed can be measured by quantity and a clock. Workmen now can be compared with each other and metered up like dynamos. The rise and fall of their energy each hour or day can be charted and filed away in a card catalogue for reference.

Immediately there follows a new science and art of industrial psychology. The efficiency of a steam engine is kept always at its maximum by feeding the coal with an automatic stoker. So the output of labor is kept at the top by adjusting the pay exactly to the motive and capacity. This is done by premiums and bonuses on output, instead of the cruder and more wasteful methods of paying the same price for every piece, and these premiums are nicely figured to the point where the workman will put out the maximum exertion for the minimum bonus. The psychology of the workman is analyzed and experimented upon as accurately as the chemistry of the different kinds of coal. A time-keeping department is created for this purpose with experts, card records, and a testing laboratory, and a new engineering profession springs up with industrial psychology as its underlying science. Wonderful and interesting are these advances in harnessing the forces of human nature to the production of wealth. The pioneers in this field, calling themselves "production

engineers," may well be compared with the great inventors of the turbine and the dynamo in what they are doing to reduce cost and multiply efficiency.

But in doing so they are doing exactly the thing that forces labor to become *class*-conscious. While a man retains individuality he is more or less proof against class feeling. He is *self*-conscious. His individuality protects him somewhat against the substitution of someone else to do his job. But when his individuality is scientifically measured off in aliquot parts and each part is threatened with substitution by identical parts of other men, then his sense of superiority is gone. He and his fellow-workmen compete with each other, not as whole men, but as units of output. The less-gifted man becomes a menace to the more gifted as much as the one to the other. Both are then ripe to recognize their solidarity, and to agree not to compete. And this is the essential thing in class conflict.

But it is significant to note that in the industries where the conditions described have gone farthest there the class conflict is least apparent. Of the 6,000,000 wage-earners mentioned, possibly 2,000,000 are organized in unions. But the unions have practically disappeared from the trusts, and are disappearing from the large corporation as they grow large enough to specialize minutely their labor. The organized workmen are found in the small establishments like the building trades, or the fringe of independents on the skirts of the trusts; on the railways where skill and responsibility are not yet displaced by division of labor; in the mines where strike-breakers cannot be shipped in; on the docks and other places where they hold a strategic position. While the number of organized workmen shows an increase in these directions it shows a decrease in the others. It is in these organized industries that the class conflict appears, and there the lines are drawing tighter. It is there that employers' associations are forcing employers into line and are struggling to do for the medium employer what the trust does without an association. But most of the unions in question are not unions of a class. They are unions of a trade or a strategic occupation. On the railroads they cater only to a third or a fourth of all railroad

employees. They represent for the most part the first stage in the class struggle—that of the skilled workmen protecting themselves through apprenticeship against the inroads of unskilled. Other unions like the shoe-makers and mine-workers represent the second stage, that of an industrial class including all occupations. The first stage has been driven out of the trust; the second stage has not arrived.

And it does not seem likely, where a corporation has reached the position of a trust, that unionism will get a footing, no matter how class-conscious the workmen have become. The very division of labor, which tends toward class solidarity, offers means to circumvent it. It need not be repeated that a potent reason for the persistent class conflict of the past twenty years is the closing up of the great outlet for agitators, the frontier. But the division of labor offers a substitute outlet in the form of promotion. Promotion, where speed is the standard, has rich possibilities compared with old forms of promotion based on skill. Under the older forms workmen came into the various skilled trades by several side entrances of apprenticeship, and each trade had its narrow limits upward. Under the newer forms the workmen nearly all come in at the bottom, and the occupations are graded by easy steps all the way to the top. The ambitious workman advances rapidly, and with every step his rate of pay increases and his work gets easier. But he remains all the time a part of the gang, and his earnings depend on the exertions of those below him. As he approaches the head of his gang he has the double job of a man who gets wages as a workman and profits on his fellow-workmen. He begins to be paid both for his work and for making others work. Quite generally it will be found that the head men of a gang are paid disproportionately high for the skill they are supposed to have. The difference is a payment, not for mechanical skill, but for loyalty. They keep their fellows up to the highest pitch of exertion and they stand by the company in times of discontent. Their promotion is not a mere outlet for agitation—it is a lid on the agitation of others.

But there is still further room for promotion, when the work-

man becomes a foreman, superintendent, or manager. Here he ceases manual work and keeps others at work. He gets a salary, often a bonus or a share in the profits, depending for its amount upon the work of his former fellows. Thus it is that a wise system of promotions becomes another branch of industrial psychology. If scientifically managed, as is done by the great corporations, it produces a steady evaporation of class feeling. I have often come upon fiery socialists and ardent trade-unionists thus vaporized and transformed by this elevating process.

In some industries, like railroads and others, the straight line of promotion is as yet obstructed by cross trade lines, and it might seem that the situation is different from that herein described. In such cases a skilled trade or two may be found which is organized and recognized by the employer on apparent class lines. But the situation is not essentially different. The true class conflict is really for the time prevented by elevating a strategic fraction of the class instead of promoting individuals. It is this kind of fractional organization, as already mentioned, that has been gradually eliminated from other industries with the growth of corporations and the division of labor.

Another line of promotion quite potent in drawing off leaders is politics. Class conflict in America is less persistent than in England and Europe, because the leaders find an outlet in salaried political jobs when the burden of agitation grows tiresome. If civil-service reform continues to make progress, this outlet, like free land, will gradually close, and the class struggle will become more intense.

While promotion at the top weakens class solidarity, immigration and women's labor at the bottom undermine it. Race divisions and their accompaniment, religious divisions, are injected, and to the inducement offered by way of promotion to exploit their fellows is added race antipathy toward those exploited. The peculiarity of class conflict is its occurrence within the dominant race. The bitterest class struggle now going on in America is that of the Western Federation of Miners, the most purely American of trade-unions. In places where that union has been defeated the employers are bringing in the Italians and the

Slavs, and the struggle is as much a defense against immigrants as an aggression on capital. In other industries like iron and steel, where the non-English foreigner is two-thirds of the force, those English-speaking workmen who have not been driven out have been promoted up to the higher positions, and both their race aversion and their superior jobs hold them aloof. In the iron mines of Minnesota, unlike the gold, silver, and copper mines of the Rockies, the Western Federation meets greater difficulty in organizing the Americans than in organizing the immigrants. In still other industries, like the coal mines, where the immigrants are more Americanized and the Americans have not escaped their competition by promotion, race and religion have been fused and an economic class has emerged. Thus immigration has a three-fold effect. At first it intensifies the conflict of classes in the dominant race. Next it shatters class solidarity. Finally, when the immigrants and their children are Americanized and promoted, they renew the class alignment. While immigration continues in great volume class lines will be forming and reforming, weak and unstable. To prohibit or greatly restrict immigration would bring forth class conflict within a generation.

The foregoing are some of the complex industrial conditions which must be taken into account in estimating the prospects of class conflict in America. There remains to be considered the question of politics. Class conflict inevitably compels the government to take a hand. The executive calls out the police, the militia, and the army. The judiciary enjoins the strikers and orders the arrest and commitment of the leaders. The struggle terminates in favor of the side that controls the policy of these branches of government. Whether we like it or not each side reaches out to get control. The contest is shifted to the field of practical politics. Here the great third party, the two-thirds of the voters, is sooner or later brought in. As long as organized labor can win by strikes or negotiation it rejects the political weapon. When strikes begin to fail and negotiation is fruitless it turns to the elections. But strikes are successful mainly in the early stages when employers have not learned the tactics of organization. After they have perfected their associations, after

these associations have federated, and especially after employers have consolidated in great corporations and trusts, their capacity for united action exceeds that of organized labor. Their tactics are directed, not so much toward winning in strikes as toward preventing strikes and disintegrating unions. By wise promotions, by watchful detectives, by prompt discharge of agitators, by an all-round increase of wages when agitation is active on the outside, by a reduction only when the menace has passed or when work is slack, by shutting down a plant where unionism is taking root and throwing orders to other plants, by establishing the so-called "open shop"—these and other masterful stratagems set up a problem quite different from what unionism has heretofore met. It does not seem possible under such conditions that organization will get a footing in the great consolidated industries. The only possibility appears to be that in the event of some widespread social unrest or depression of trade, the thousands of these employees throughout the country will suddenly quit work, on the impulse and without prior organization or concerted action. Such an unlikely revolution would quickly end in submission.

Neither does it seem possible that these thousands of employees will turn to a socialist party. This is not because they are not ripening for socialism. Nothing is more surprising than the numbers of well-paid men employed by the trusts and great corporations who say in confidence that they are socialists. It is not their wages of which they complain, but the long hours, the intense speed and exertion, the two shifts of 12 hours six or seven days in the week, the Sunday labor sometimes continuing twenty-four hours in succession when the day and night shifts change. Their physical exhaustion and continuous work nullify the enjoyment of their good wages. But the very reasons that keep them from unionizing keep them from voting or discussing. They distrust politics, they think the socialist party has no chance, they are not willing to lose their jobs, they are in the minority, and the great mass of their fellow-workmen have but little time and strength to think and talk of anything except the gossip of their daily work. I do not look for a socialist party to recruit these voters—I look for a demagogue.

If we may judge from what has happened in two other English-speaking nations, Australia and Great Britain, a labor party may be expected. In Australia this party followed upon a series of widespread and disastrous strikes. In Great Britain it followed a supreme court decision that jeopardized the funds of trade-unions. But a party formed on class lines cannot enlist more recruits than there are in the class. In this case, at the outside, it is one-third of the voters. Whether a socialist or labor party shall ever be able to reach even this number depends on the attitude taken by the other two-thirds. If they demand fair play and if they are able to enforce their demand, a class party will not attract even its own class. More inspiring to the ordinary man than the struggle for class advantage is the instinct of justice. But justice is not merely fair play between individuals, as our legal philosophy would have it—it is fair play between social classes. The great constitutional safeguards which we have asserted since the time of Magna Charta have been adopted in order to place a subordinate class on an equilibrium with a dominant class. It is in this way that trial by jury has had to be reasserted whenever a new social class has emerged. And it is partly by restoring trial by jury that the great third class, the public, is now beginning to assert its right to hold the balance between two struggling classes. This beginning may be seen in the new constitution framed by the farmers of Oklahoma.

Class conflict may be growing but it is not inevitable if this third class, which is not a class, is able to determine directly the issues. There are, indeed, serious obstacles in the way. The principal one is political. Between the public and the expression of its will are the political party, the party machine, and a legislature, executive, and judges selected by these intruders. Here is a backstairs for manipulation, corruption, and class legislation. But the public at large is too big and too exposed for the wire-pulling of classes. And it does not consent that one class shall have an advantage over another. It does not favor either radicals or reactionaries. When the public shall have more direct means of expressing its will, through direct nomination, direct election, initiative, or referendum, then we may expect class con-

flict to subside. The class war in Colorado broke out because the legislature refused to carry out the will of the people as expressed in a constitutional amendment. A popular verdict may not always be just, but it insures non-resistance. It is not so much abstract justice that satisfies individuals and classes, as confidence in a full hearing, a fair trial, and honest execution of the verdict. If these are guaranteed, the issue may be brought up again. Class antagonism will not disappear as long as there is wealth to distribute, but it can be transferred to the jury of the people. Then we may expect social classes to state their case in the open and to wait on the gradual process of education rather than plunge into battle.

I do not hold that this third class is disinterested and that its will is always right. Economically it stands apart as a class of consumers. It is interested directly in low prices for the products it purchases. The existing widespread movement for the regulation of corporations is a movement for reducing monopoly prices. If it is carried through, the consumers will be conciliated and satisfied. But they will be satisfied on the basis of existing wages, hours, and conditions of labor. A movement of wage-earners for larger wages and shorter hours will then meet their hostility as well as that of the immediate employers. If the regulation of corporations on behalf of consumers is not accompanied with regulation on behalf of employees, the class conflict may become more intense and difficult. Time is the essence of prevention. It is not merely blind economic evolution that provokes economic classes into existence. It is class legislation in the past. The protective tariff has appealed to wage-earners and the public on behalf of manufacturers, but it has contained no provision, like that in the Australian tariff,¹ by which the profits of the tariff should be shared with wage-earners. It has been left to them to get what they could by trade-unions. With such an example of class legislation before them it is not surprising that, when unions are crushed by the great tariff-protected trusts,

¹ The Australian Excise Tariff Act of 1906 places an internal revenue tax equal to one-half the tariff on home manufactures, the same to be remitted if the manufacturer shows that wages paid are fair and reasonable.

then the wage-earners should think of socialism. But it does not follow that the tariff should be abolished. It follows that when it is revised it should provide means to pass the protection along to the wage-earners as well as conciliate the consumers.

Other lines of legislation might be mentioned, which would tend to place social classes on an equilibrium. Whether they do so or not depends on whether they come before the whole people soon enough, on their merits and without the intermediary of political machinery. If this occurs then no one class or part of a class will be big enough to swing all the voters. Like the waves on the ocean it may move up and down but it comes back to the level of the massive bulk beneath.

DISCUSSION

PROFESSOR GRAHAM TAYLOR, CHICAGO, ILL.

However we may differ with some of the conclusions of the paper, I think those of us who are nearest the facts will agree that the analysis of the situation was fundamental, even exhaustive. I have thought that the brief time that was at my command might best be spent in describing to you a concrete experience in a situation which exemplifies and enforces almost all the factors of the problem stated in this paper.

In this population under review there was great complexity. There was racial division, keen and sharp-edged, because upon this particular district of Chicago there breaks, like the surf upon the sand, each new wave of immigration. And the Irishman has not yet become reconciled to the Italian, nor the Norwegian to the Pole, nor all four of them to the Armenian and the Greek, to say nothing of the other nationalities represented. They were still further divided by the four religious classifications, the Greek, Gregorian, Roman, and Protestant. Then there was a still more marked lack of unity in this particular population because some of them were independent merchants and street venders, but the great bulk of them were day laborers. They were positively disinterested in the discussion of the economic aspects of their own labor conditions. After nearly seven years of a free floor discussion in the midst of that population, some of the most intelligent young Americanized mechanics requested that it might be discontinued, because the class-consciousness of the men who took part in the discussion was too high for their consciousness, and they did not wish to be considered as so entirely apart from current opinion and public policy. There was no common ground among them; they were thrown together by the vicissitudes of immigration.

All at once the great teamsters' strike swept over the city. For a while there was no more interest in it than in any other little labor agitation. But

when the strike-breakers began to be introduced into the city and began to drive the coal carts up that avenue, there was a strange agitation, like the breaking up of the foundations of the great deep. There were little knots of people gathered here and there. As the wagons passed, the tenement house windows began to be lined by the women. Hostile demonstrations began with little citizens scarcely more than knee-high, and as these men drove the coal wagons up and down that avenue, women with babies at their breasts and little boys and girls would double up their fists and shout at the top of their voices, "Down with the scab!"

There was a sudden psychological change. Mr. Commons calls it industrial psychology. I should like to say it was a mass psychology. There was nothing very volitional about it, but it was almost wholly instinctive. There was no deliberative choice about it, but a kind of a reversion to type. It was the cry of the wild and the response thereto. Thus suddenly these people of many names and nationalities and tongues were merged into one solid mass—so much so that those coal wagons had to be protected by long platoons of police and by a patrol wagon heading the procession, every morning as they went up and every noon as they came down the street. And in passing a little playground these terrified teamsters were so fearful that one of them actually jumped off his driver's seat, rushed into the playground—where there was nobody but youngsters—and flourished a revolver to protect his life, so scared was he at this sudden reversion to mass consciousness. This is only an illustration of what the union men mean when, in times of stress, they talk to you about "the movement" instead of about the organization. I have often noticed how they drop that word "union" and "organization" in the time of great crises, and say "the movement is safe."

A man cannot get close to that movement without feeling that it is elemental, primal; it is leaderless—less dependent upon leadership than any other movement in history; more absolutely inevitable than any other organization. It is there, and it is there to stay, it is there to increase; it is there to subside once in a while from sight, but all at once to emerge again, a mighty power like some tidal wave of the sea.

I do not like to call it a class movement. It is rather a movement of the mass. If I were to illustrate the class movement, I should say that I had never seen so much class-consciousness among the working people as I have always detected among the employers. There is no such class-consciousness in the ranks of labor as anyone can detect for himself in the ranks of the employing, merchant, and capitalistic classes.

Now as to whether this movement, whatever it is, is to be inevitable and is to grow: to what proportions it may grow, it seems to me, is a relative question; it depends upon certain contingencies. Up to the point of being assured equality before the law, up to the point of equality of political oppor-

tunity, this movement will grow in turbulence, in menace, and in revolutionary spirit. The last race on the face of the earth to be driven into the ranks of socialism were the old Hollanders, but when the military forces were called in to put down that railroad strike in Holland, the class movement along trade lines suddenly merged with the Belgian Socialists; and I was more amazed than by anything I saw in Europe when a thousand of those phlegmatic day laborers at the Hague took the train to attend a great socialist demonstration in Brussels. If that can be done in Holland, what may not be done if the repression goes so far, politically and legislatively, as to violate the sense of justice and human equality before the law on the part of the great mass of American and Americanized labor?

If only there be political equality, then it seems to me that this movement will follow the course taken in Great Britain and I believe that that course has already begun to be followed. We have had a wonderful demonstration of the political intelligence of the great masses of voters in Chicago, even in the immigrant wards. In a paper which somewhat animadverted against the referendum, at the meeting of the Political Science section, an exception was made of the referendum votes in the city of Chicago. Now, the extraordinary thing about those votes lies in this fact, that, although the popular side of those railway questions was at one time expressed by voting "yes" and the next time expressed by voting "no," the people made that choice intelligently. Moreover, they discriminated between ownership and operation with rare intelligence. But as for the assertion of the public rights as against corporate aggression, in that long ten years' struggle in Chicago for the people's rights to their streets, the great democracy of the second greatest city in the Union gathered strength and volume as it went on. Now that movement is going on. The practical politicians will continue to be strongly against direct primaries and direct legislation. Nevertheless the ills of democracy are to be cured only by having more, not less democracy. The will of the electorate is insistent and will be found to be persistent. The party machinery that now stands in the way of the direct primary and of the direct expression of the will of the people must be taken out of the way. Party obligations, party divisions are perceptibly losing their hold, daily and hourly. Even the immigrants that used to be rounded up by the padrones are asserting their independence. I have seen four hundred of my Italian neighbors march with a transparency bearing this bid for bribery: "This political club open to engagement." Poor souls, they knew not what their leaders meant! But at last the Italian vote divided: that is the beginning of the end.

Now, if there be equality of political opportunity and equality before the law, there will be a peaceful and evolutionary development of this mass instinct, this elemental consciousness that "all of us are worth more than some of us." I do not believe that it will take in the whole socialist pro-

gramme by any means. But I think that the solution is coming in two very diametrically different ways. In the first place, this agitation for industrial education and trade schools which is spreading all over the country is going after a while to throw more and more intelligent and trained men into the ranks of the wage-earning mechanical classes. We will then begin to get the leadership of American labor such as the British trade-unions have had and so amazingly profit by. And as the status becomes more fixed, as it is going to be more and more difficult for men to change their status and work up through the stratification that is likely to become more impervious to this elevating influence which Mr. Commons spoke of, we are going to have abler men and men capable of political leadership. Then something is going to happen, and it is going to happen not so much in the area of national politics as in that area which gives labor the best chance it ever had in the world to gain political supremacy—the state governments. No such opportunity has ever been placed before the toiling electorate as the state governments of the United States. Of course the agricultural states will be the last to be won, and those states in which commercial interests predominate will also lag behind, but in the industrial states the legislatures are to be, and are now, the goal of the political ambition of organized labor. With Mr. Commons we can see that as clearly as the dawn. The longest-headed men in the labor movement are just awaiting their opportunity to do what they have done in England—shift the balance of power, not necessarily by any widespread third-party movement, but by gaining one representative here and another there, and wielding their power like the hammer of Thor. That is what the labor representation movement of England has done. That is what some labor representation movement in American politics will some time do. In the last analysis the direction of this movement is in the hands of organized labor. Nor is it in the hands or within the power of organized capital to suppress it. If anything is absurd it is the positive claims of some men who think, or seem to think, they can sweep the earth clear of organized labor, men who claim the right to appoint their own working terms, men who expect the working-men to deal with them individually. The sense of fair play on the part of that greatest of all parties to every industrial issue, the public, will never stand for that injustice. And as the public becomes educated, as the public sees the issue clearly, there is going to be fair play. There is going to be more and more equality before the law, and there is going to be equality of political opportunity. The opportunist's duty of the present moment, therefore, is the education of the public. The appeal to the sense of equity and fair play is seldom without a quick and decisive response from the American public.

But repression, any attempt to silence, any effort to drive back that which has thus started forward, can result disastrously and only disastrously to all concerned. I do not look for any markedly revolutionary spirit. Once in a

while evolution may hurry up a bit, but it will still maintain its evolutionary character. It seems to me as though when you get close to the peasant simplicity of most of our working people, if you see their love of home, if you realize their profound reverence for government, if you see them depositing their little earnings in the bank that bears the name of "State Bank," and, when the bank fails, stand around in blank amazement that the state is not going to stand by its own name, you will never doubt the essential, fundamental loyalty of the great mass of American immigrants to the institutions of our country.

No, ladies and gentlemen, the class-conscious movement is inevitable, because without it the individual cannot maintain his freedom of contract. Men will continue to divide, so as to unite in still grander and more glorious union. I really believe that those who are most pessimistic are farthest from the field of action, and that those who are in the thick of the struggle are most optimistic in regard to the mass movements of American labor, most optimistic of its peaceful and evolutionary and triumphant struggle for justice and equity.

MISS JANE ADDAMS, CHICAGO, ILL.

My opinion in regard to this question, I am sorry to say, varies from time to time, like that of the woman who was asked whether her husband was a Christian. She said that sometimes when she heard him speak at prayer meetings she thought he was, and sometimes when she heard him speak at home she thought he was not, so that, although she was sorry to seem so stupid, she really could not tell. Sometimes when I hear the talk in labor meetings, especially when the speaker is a good, straight socialist, I am quite sure that we are going through the same economic development in America that other countries have experienced and that we can only reach the inevitable salvation through a class conflict; then there are other periods when I see people of divers economic standing going about their daily work with very similar hopes and ambitions and I conclude that after all there is not much class conflict in America. I should like to take up three points in Mr. Commons' paper, one for and two against the contention that the class-conscious struggle is increasing in America.

The first point in the paper which occurs to me to be open to discussion is the statement that as but one-third of the workers are engaged in industrial processes, they alone are subjected to the acute operations of class-consciousness. To my mind it does not follow that the other two-thirds are not also subjected to the same social results of industry. The "industrial conflict" is very absorbing and has many characteristics of a game. Modern life does not offer many episodes which are as exciting as a strike. The "industrial psychology"—I am very grateful to Mr. Commons for that phrase—divides people into two camps, through their sympathies quite as

definitely as it does through their experiences. In moments of real excitement "the fair-minded public," who ought to be depended upon as a referee, practically disappears. At least that has been our experience in Chicago during the teamsters' strike and other similar moments. This increasing sense of sympathetic participation is therefore, to my mind, a point in favor of the contention that class-consciousness is growing.

The next points which I should like to discuss present arguments against a class-conscious struggle. First, the point which Mr. Commons made in regard to immigration: That the first experiences of the immigrants in America doubtless break into their former European class-consciousness, but that later the immigrants are incorporated into the working-class consciousness which is rapidly being formed in America, and that thus an orderly development goes on. I quite agree with Mr. Commons' description of the immigrants' first experience but not with his second. My observation leads me to conclude that the result upon the immigrants of having had their class-consciousness broken into, and the necessity of making new and unprecedented connections with the community about them, is in itself such an educating process that when they reach the second stage in which class-consciousness begins to form again on other lines, the process itself has been so educating that they can't get back to the original position in order to start afresh; the very basis has evaporated so to speak. If you are an Italian and are forced to make friends through the very exigencies of the situation with a Polish Jew representing another nationality, another religion which cuts into all your most cherished prejudices, it isn't so hard after that to make a larger synthesis and include everybody with whom you come in contact. All succeeding efforts will be less fundamental and easier to make. People are after all more or less alike, and it is much harder to utilize your prejudices after they have once failed you than it was to break into them the first time. It requires less effort to be friends with your employer than it required in the first place to be friends with your alien fellow-employee if one effort follows after the other. Immigration by its very variety is bringing in its own education. An old enemy working by your side has turned into a comrade. It is quite possible that your employer formerly regarded as an enemy, mitigated by feudal survivals, is also not so bad.

Mr. Commons made a most suggestive analysis of the effect of the "trust" upon the situation. The trust is of course the great educator of us all, and I suppose in the end, as a brilliant Englishman has said, "The trust, when it is finished, will bring forth socialism," for its unimpeded growth must at last include all of us. The fact that the trust breaks up temporary trade-unionism brings the workers into a state of mind—may I use the phrase industrial psychology again—which makes it difficult to get back to the class-conscious position. I have heard many discussions in regard to the evils of the speeding-up process which we have just heard described by Mr. Commons,

but the man whom I heard speak most bitterly in regard to it was himself a manager in a huge manufacturing plant. The managers in the various departments of such a plant compete with each other and the one who drives his men the hardest, whose department makes the best showing in the reduction of cost, is the one in line for promotion. The manager feels the wretchedness of such a situation very keenly and the workmen under him know how he feels about it. There grows up a certain common experience between them and the men say, "The manager is in the same box with us." The blame for the actual condition of things is thus transferred from the actual manager of a department to the one next in authority on and on until it reaches the stockholders or that which in the popular mind is a horrible thing, the trust itself. When the blame reaches the trust it must become impersonal, for the stockholders of a given concern change every day with the operations of the stock exchange. When an enemy is impersonal, it is difficult to be bitter, although one may yet be very bellicose and determined. When the trust is the enemy it comes to be a matter for governmental action. I suppose one reason for the popularity of the recent federal attempts to regulate the trusts has been the impression that the President is a general leading the nation against a common enemy; that the cause of economic difficulty has at last been located. But to advance toward a common enemy is to unite all those who march into a sense of comradeship and mutual undertaking which for the moment at least makes class feeling between them extremely difficult. One may almost assert that so long as the nation is in this mood, class-consciousness is not increasing.

From my own experience I should say perhaps that the one symptom among working-men which most definitely indicates a class feeling is a growing distrust of the integrity of the courts, the belief that the present judge has been a corporation attorney, that his sympathies and experience and his whole view of life is on the corporation side. Either this distrust is growing rapidly or the statement of it is being more distinctly made every day. It may be that with the advance in social legislation which has been discerned by the reader of the paper and has been reasserted by Mr. Taylor this distrust will be allayed. Certainly it has been apparent throughout all the discussions today that the scholar and the working-man are uniting in a demand for social legislation, and it may well be possible that the amelioration which we all hope is thus being inaugurated will result in a further lessening of the class conflict. I know of course, that such a statement must sound like "rose water for the plague," but in an effort to give quite honestly and plainly one's own experience, one can only after all reaffirm the careful analysis of the situation as made by Mr. Commons which shows that the conflict is disappearing from the very exigencies of industry: that the newer organization of industry brings the employer himself into a position subordinate to the trust: the trust is composed of the constantly changing stock-

holders; the trust can be controlled only by the government which after all in a democracy is composed of all the citizens, a universal class. In making this rose-colored deduction, I realize that I am speaking vaguely, but I hope not foolishly.

PROFESSOR ALVIN S. JOHNSON, UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

It seems to be agreed that we have at least the raw material for class conflict. Now I understand that Professor Commons has in mind not simply a conflict of ideas or a conflict of ideals, but that a class conflict is something more violent—not necessarily a revolution, perhaps, but a period of riot and disorder.

Whether this is inevitable or not depends upon a great many things. In the first place, have we such classes? Are six million working-men now a class? I think not. Will they form a class? One necessary condition is that they shall be provided with leaders. But Professor Commons has shown how working class leaders have been drained away. Well, political experience has shown that leaders multiply according to the food-supply. It is an expensive thing to buy off leaders; in fact, a great many reform movements have been started to get rid of the expense of supporting political leaders, and I think we shall find that before very long the number of industrial leaders who have to be maintained will be so great that a new method will have to be employed: organized resistance on the part of employers. This will result in the creation of a class-consciousness among working-men.

The working class has opposed to it the smaller class of the direct employers of labor—two million, Professor Commons estimates it; and as there are twenty-four million voters in all, something like sixteen million are left to arbitrate between the two million and the six million. It is a question in my mind whether these sixteen million will serve as impartial arbitrators. A large contingent—the agricultural laborers and the small farmers—will naturally sympathize with the laboring classes. Another contingent, embracing, we may say, men of small property and the professional classes, manifest a great deal of sympathy with the laboring classes; they recognize nevertheless the rights of capital. Will they continue to be neutral? We shall have to answer this question by considering what it is that the class of laborers will demand. If their demands are limited to matters of comparatively minor importance, as, for example, restrictions upon the employment of military forces to police a strike, this class will be ready to judge very fairly between the laborer and the employer.

But will the working class in the long run be content with anything of this kind? I think not. The fundamental demand of every man is that he shall have security; a reasonable degree of comfort; that he shall hold his position under reasonable conditions; that he shall receive reasonable pay; that in old age he shall not be a pauper, and that in sickness he shall not be left destitute. These things the laborer will demand. But can they all be

granted? Some of them will mean increased taxation, and that means a burden for the small property owner, and for the professional classes also. Some of these demands create a clear opposition between the rights of labor and the rights of property. In my opinion, a good many of us who are now so solicitous about the rights of the working-man will scurry to cover just as soon as the real demands of the laboring classes appear.

Let me tell you an incident that occurred at San Francisco during the summer. A young man whom I had known for many years to be sympathetic to the working-man came out to study labor conditions in that city. He was riding on a street-car operated by scabs, but he didn't know it. Two stalwart unionists pulled him off the car and threw him into a vat of mortar. He came out of that vat a dyed-in-the-wool conservative.

If ever the working class becomes strongly organized throughout the country, we who are not directly engaged in the class conflict will meet with many unpleasant experiences and we shall find our impartiality somewhat impaired. Those of us who do not attach ourselves to the party of the working-man will unconsciously support the employing class. There will be no impartial jury to whom the questions at issue may be submitted.

PROFESSOR HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The thing underlying class conflict is the effort to secure a larger share of the economic surplus. I doubt whether the lines of sharpest conflict at present are those drawn horizontally through industry, separating employer and employee. Are they not rather the lines drawn vertically, separating different industries, or more exactly, separating monopolists from all other members of the community? Though this is not the ordinary notion of class conflict, yet it appears to me unquestionable that the real economic struggle of our day is between monopoly and privilege on the one side, and the consumers of monopoly goods and the unprivileged on the other. More and more, political issues frame themselves along these lines. Consequently I use the term class conflict to include all struggles of classes to increase their share in the economic surplus, whether it be the struggle of employees against employers, or of the unprivileged part of the community against monopoly and privilege.

Existing economic arrangements are rooted in an older state of industry, in which they represented, perhaps, some approximation to fairness. As such, they crystallized into law. The growth of large-scale business and monopoly has made those arrangements work greatly to the advantage of certain favored individuals, as compared with the rest of society. Hence most thinking people have begun to question the fairness of the distribution of income sanctioned by law. This inevitably breeds class conflict; for the beneficiaries of the present system will evidently not yield without a struggle. Such seem to be the underlying facts of the present situation.

As to the issue of the conflict, one thing appears tolerably certain, whatever may be one's judgment as to the abstract justice of the claims advanced. As the mass of the people become more intelligent, and as political arrangements become democratic in fact as well as in name, the great body of citizens, the unprivileged of the present time, are bound more and more to embody their ideas of fairness and justice into law, and make distribution far more nearly equal than it is now. If they are not allowed to do it in accordance with the orderly processes of legislation, then they will do it by violence; for it is inconceivable that existing inequalities can be tolerated indefinitely in a democratic society. Such, to my mind, is the broad meaning of all class struggles at this time.

If this be true, the practical problem becomes, how shall social arrangements be modified so as to compel the privileged class to give ground gradually, without forcing violent class conflict and possible revolution, and how shall the demands of the oncoming democracy be made sane, reasonable, and practicable of attainment? Professor Commons has pointed out the necessity of increasingly efficient forms of political democracy. The most perfect political machinery, however, will be of little avail unless we join with it effective machinery for learning and making public all the essential facts concerning the great strategic industries. It is in transportation, mining, public utilities, steel making, oil producing, sugar refining, and the like industries, that the great privileged interests are most strongly entrenched. Here the surplus piles up, here the attack is sharpest, here the conflict waxes hottest. Here no amount of democracy can save us, unless it is joined with a wide knowledge of the facts of industry. The men in industry, trained in a school of extreme individualism, will never give us the facts till they have to. But our present lack of knowledge breeds suspicion, mutual distrust, inconsiderate radicalism. To withhold the facts is only to dam back the river till it rises and breaks over its banks in a devastating flood. Hence our time has no more important task, if social peace is to be preserved, than to devise such accounting and reporting machinery as will exact from the captains of industry and give to the public definite information as to investment, methods of operation, and standards of service, costs, prices, profits and their distribution, in all the great industries. Only on the basis of such information can we move intelligently toward that increasing equality of distribution which is bound to come whether we will or no; only on this basis can we decide in each case whether we shall content ourselves with mere public control of industry, or shall enter on the more radical policy of public operation. Shall we continue our present system of blundering along in the dark, or shall we get the knowledge that will light our path in the future? If the former, we insure for ourselves increasingly sharp class conflict, possibly ending in violent revolution; if the latter, we set our feet on the path of sane and progressive democracy, we take the first great step in freeing the state from its

present sinister control by men of great wealth, we make it possible to put industry in its proper place as the minister to popular well-being, and not as the master of the state and its citizens.

PROFESSOR ROBERT F. HOXIE, THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

In dealing with problems of this kind, there seems always to be danger of diffused and fruitless attention to a multitude of specific facts and remedies, to the relative neglect of fundamental and guiding principles. Without any direct or implied criticism of my colleagues, therefore, I wish for a moment to carry the discussion back to the most fundamental matter with which we have here any concern—namely, the *causes* of class conflict.

It has been generally assumed that class conflict is the outcome solely of differences of interest between the membership of different social groups. Now the point that I wish to make is this: Real difference of interest between those who belong to different social groups is not the only, nor perhaps even the most essential, factor in the development of classes and class conflict. In order that classes and class conflict may develop, it is necessary only that the membership of different groups should believe their essential interests to be diverse, and a sufficient cause for belief in difference of essential interest is to be found in differences of materio-economic group discipline.

I can best show what is meant by the phrase "differences of group discipline," and best prove their outcome to be class conflict, by taking a concrete example based on conditions as we find them in the United States at the present time.

We have in the United States at least two recognized systems of materio-economic environment. I refer of course to what are commonly known as the working class or industrial environment and the capitalist-employing class or pecuniary environment. In essential respects these environments are diverse, and each subjects those who come most fully and exclusively within its control to a fairly definite and characteristic intellectual and moral disciplinary influence.¹

In the extreme case the industrial worker is subjected in connection with his most vital and predominant concern—the process of getting a living—to an environment in which blind physical or mechanical force seems to be dominant. He works on inert material with physical tools, operated by his

¹ It should be noted particularly that what follows does not purport to furnish a complete explanation of the characteristic psychological traits of laborers and employers. It is understood that there are and have been other disciplinary influences besides those furnished by the present typical working environments. The writer merely tries to sketch roughly a working theory of class conflict in the United States, not a complete theory of class formation and development. The distinction is important.

own muscles or by energy imparted to machinery from some visible physical source. He works to bring about some visible physical change in his material or to transform it into physical energy for thus changing other material. He sees that the result is in proportion to the physical force exerted and that identical results always follow from identical physical situations or combinations of forces. He sees in other words that general invariable laws characterize the world of material things which forms so important a part of his environment.

But it is not alone the world of material things which, according to the daily experiences of the industrial worker, is dominated by the invariable laws of physical force. To him, situated as he is, these laws seem to determine the relations also between the man and the material. He finds that the man is but the servant of physical force and law. He it is who must conform in time, in place, in action to the laws governing the character of the material and the character of the available force.

Nor is this all. It is not merely in his view the world of material things and the relations of man to these things that fall under the domination of the laws of physical force. According to his experience also the relations of man to man are thus determined. His action as an individual is controlled by the character of the machinery with which he works; the individual machine stands definitely related by mechanical necessity to the whole machinery of the individual, industrial process; and thus to the machinery of related process, so that the worker finds himself and his fellows definitely related to one another in a huge machine-process by virtue of these same general invariable laws which characterize the world of material things.

These laws, the worker's experience teaches him, are blind, unmoral. If he attempts to violate them, the mechanical results will not wait on his convenience or be guided by his welfare. Suffering, love, mercy, faith, hope, are nothing to this universal dominating and transforming physical force. The explosion is not delayed, the fire burns, the knife cuts, the machine mangles, and the process goes on unmoved by the defiance of the strong or by the prayers and sufferings of the weak or the just.

All this necessarily reacts upon the man psychologically. In proportion as his essential activities and relationships come to be determined by physical force and law he becomes mechanical in his mental processes. He comes to think in terms of blind physical cause and effect. He grows fatalistic, atheistic. Physical causation comes to be for him the dominant and final sanction.

Turning now to the environment of the capitalist employer or pecuniary worker, we find in the extreme case an essentially different discipline and psychological outcome. The world of the pecuniary worker is primarily a world of men. He is dependent on the mechanical forces; but the physical force and blind law which permeate his world operate not directly upon him

in his vital activities but upon his agents. His primary concern is not with physical but with pecuniary results—with the control and acquisition of pecuniary energy. His world is therefore dominated primarily by spiritual force. In place of the invariable laws of the material universe, he has to deal, in connection with his most vital concerns, with variable human will, caprice, and cunning, and their institutional outcome. Personality, individual insight, moral and legal strength or weakness, here dominate situations and determine results. He comes therefore inevitably to think in terms of these and similar spiritual forces. He grows animistic, theistic, legalistic. Acquisition, authority, legality, come for him to be the dominant and final sanctions.

Now these differences in fundamental belief, in terms of thought, and in what are considered as sanctions of action and relation, in proportion as they prevail, make it impossible for the members of the industrial and pecuniary classes to agree in regard to truth, justice, and virtue in many concrete cases. This is especially so in respect to the most vital matters of their mutual concern. The industrial worker, for example, reasoning on the basis of fundamental notions given him by his peculiar environment, tends to look upon production as a process of physical transformation; upon the producer as the one immediately concerned with this physical transformation; and upon ownership as confirmed by physical transformation. Against the right thus established, ownership sanctioned by mere acquisition, possession, or legality, tends to be relatively inconclusive. The pecuniary worker on the other hand sees at most only a step in production in the mere mechanical process, and very little in this process to confer ownership. To him production is a market phenomenon—the producer, and therefore the owner, is the one under whose manipulation of the market value appears.

Under such circumstances, where each group is bound to deny what the other regards as the most fundamental postulates in regard to the most vital rights, conflict, I believe, is bound to exist; bound to exist in spite of all the proof that economists, sociologists, moralists, and religionists can muster to show that the real interests of these groups are fundamentally harmonious; and bound to exist, in a democratic country, in physical or political form, in spite of any authority which can be evoked to prevent it.

Application of the theory of class conflict, thus roughly and partially sketched, to the situation in the United States will I believe lead to conclusions somewhat different from those which have been reached in the leading paper of this series.

It would of course be gross error to say that in the United States all men may be divided into these two classes, the membership of the one falling distinctly and exclusively under the discipline of the industrial and the other under that of the pecuniary environment. Numerous and important exceptions would have to be taken to such a statement. It is not claimed

that the average laborer is molded entirely by contact with physical force and law, nor that the average employer is a creature solely of the market. There is of course a great common social and physical environment which exerts a disciplinary influence on both pecuniary and industrial workers. Moreover, in so far as these pecuniary and industrial disciplines exist, what I have attempted to characterize constitute not the usual but the extreme types, and men who may be classed as belonging to the industrial or the pecuniary group fall under what may be taken as their characteristic group discipline in greatly varying degrees. Finally, the actual discipline of perhaps the majority of men in the United States includes characteristic elements derived from both the typical industrial and pecuniary environments.

But all these admissions do not serve to invalidate the main contention. It remains true that as things actually are in the United States today, there are these two fairly distinct disciplinary environmental systems; that there are two fairly large and mutually exclusive groups of men, the one deriving its predominant formative disciplinary influences from the industrial and the other from the pecuniary environment. Moreover, with few exceptions those of every occupation and station in our society (because of working experience or association, or inherited fundamental notions and tendencies of thought) find themselves more or less closely allied in point of view and supposed interest with the one or the other of the classes which I have endeavored to characterize; so that, as things are, our society tends to differentiate intellectually and emotionally into two groups, between the most radical representatives of which the skirmishing of class conflict perpetually exists and perpetually threatens to involve all in conflict.

As yet of course the membership of these two great social groups is not clearly differentiated in all cases. Many individuals and occupational groups derive their discipline partly from the industrial and partly from the pecuniary environment; they have not become definitely and exclusively associated with one or the other of the fighting classes. But I believe that if time permitted I could show that the disciplinary situation is developing in the United States in such a manner as to insure steady growth toward such a definite classification of men and occupational groups; toward a situation, therefore, in which the outbreak of serious conflict between the industrial and pecuniary workers will find individuals, and occupational groups generally, definitely aligned as partisans respectively of these fighting classes.

Is this conflict then inevitable? Obviously, if our theory is correct, class conflict in the United States is bound to exist, unless something should happen to alter essentially the disciplinary situation—either to obviate entirely or partially the differences in discipline which now exist, or to neutralize their effects.

Can, then, these disciplinary differences be obviated? Evidently not, since they seem to be a necessary aspect of the developing life process in society.

Without these differences no division of labor, no specialization, no development of efficiency and individuality could exist. To obviate them we should have to accept the simplicity, stagnation, and atrophy of the small communistic community.

Unless then someone can point out the forces which may be depended on to lessen these seemingly inherent disciplinary differences or to neutralize their psychological effects we shall have to conclude that class conflict in the United States is inevitable.

Are we offered, in the paper which is supposed to be under discussion, anything that may be taken as capable of mitigating the disciplinary situation or its resultant class conflict? An analysis of this paper seems to show that, according to its author, reliance for the mitigation and perhaps suppression of class conflict is to be placed in the main upon authority. The authority which is invoked is the "public," conceived as a *third* class, numbering two-thirds of the population, occupying the position of a spectator relative to the conflict of the other classes, essentially disinterested, desiring fair play and justice. This superior authority—the public—may prevent class conflict, we are told, by means of fair law and fair administration which, it is assumed, will content the warring classes because "a popular verdict may not always be just, but it insures non-resistance. It is not so much abstract justice that satisfies individuals and classes, as confidence in a full hearing, a fair trial, and an honest execution of the verdict."

Is this position well taken? Not if the theory of class conflict which I have tried to outline is accepted. If this theory holds, there is no such thing possible in the United States as a *disinterested* public because there is no third discipline unrelated to the disciplines of the fighting classes. Though, as we have seen, those who are subjected to the extreme discipline of either the industrial or pecuniary environment are relatively few, still the members of this third class share to some extent and in very varying degrees the discipline of the fighting classes, and there are few or none belonging to this third class whose individual disciplines are not determined in essentials more by the characteristic environment of one of those fighting classes than by that of the other. There are then few or none of the members of the great public who are not bound to one rather than the other of these fighting classes, to some degree, by similarity in point of view and therefore by sympathy and assumed likeness of interest. In short, there can be no large, homogeneous disinterested third class, whose members can agree upon a formula for the settlement of class disputes.

But we are told that there is a public, a great public, whose members are not so immediately concerned with the fight that they do not desire fair play and justice. This I would readily enough grant. But what is fair play, and what is justice? What determines men's notions of these things in the concrete? What seem justice and fair play to you are not justice and fair

play to me if the fundamental postulates and preconceptions with which we approach the concrete proposition differ essentially. And they will so differ if the moral and intellectual disciplines which we have derived from our respective environments essentially differ. The mere desire of the public for fair play will not insure social peace when fair laws and impartial justice must always be myths to one or the other of the parties to the class conflict. Who is to make the laws that will *seem* fair to both, and who is to administer justice that will *appear* impartial to those whose essential notions of justice are altogether irreconcilable—between whom there is nothing to arbitrate because there is no mutually admitted basis of justice or fairness.

But after all it is not abstract justice we are assured but a full hearing, a fair trial and an honest execution of the verdict which men desire. I doubt it. But, grant it. Still, who is to define, to the mutual satisfaction of men unable to agree on any fundamental matter, these fundamental terms "*full hearing*," "*fair trial*" and "*honest execution*"? Who even is to define these phrases to the satisfaction of the supposed authority which is to use them as a basis for adjudication? Our utter and manifest inability to answer these questions shows, I think, that we have here no real remedy for class conflict, and, to that extent, must strengthen our belief in the inevitability of this conflict in the United States.

I am well aware that this partial criticism of the position taken in the paper under discussion does not warrant a positive conclusion on the question at issue. To reach such a conclusion would require exhaustive study of the most vital biological and sociological data. But I believe that the known data in these fields is already sufficient to confirm the theory of conflict which I have sketched, and that as this theory is further applied, evidence showing the inevitability of the class conflict will steadily accumulate.

MRS. C. P. GILMAN, NEW YORK CITY

I would suggest that there is still another class in America to which no reference has been made—one which I consider to outnumber or at least to equal any of these other classes mentioned, that is, the women. It is quite possible that with their growing education, their growing interest in public affairs, their growing recognition of the duty of citizenship, they may be able to contribute something in the way of a public point of view, a general point of view, a point of view that has in mind the interests of the human race and not of any specific class. If women are not a class, why legislate upon them as such? If they are, why not mention them in such a discussion as this?

RESPONSE OF PROFESSOR JOHN R. COMMONS TO DISCUSSIONS

Mr. Hoxie has gone several flights above me on industrial psychology. He has added pecuniary psychology. I think he has made an important con-

tribution to the discussion but has not changed the outcome. You will notice that his psychology is based very definitely upon the industrial facts themselves. It follows accurately, like the reflection in a mirror, the mechanical fact on the one hand which makes one class, and the pecuniary fact that makes the other class. All that I can see that he has added is his method of tracing the operation of class interest from the occupation into the mind of the man. If, therefore, my analysis of the general situation in the country is true, and there are one-third of the population who are mixed mechanical and pecuniary, then you have two-thirds of the population that cannot be lined up on any philosophy based on industrial psychology. I contend that he has not made any change in that particular fact. The farmer is one-third of this population. The farmer works with his hands, but he also sells his crops. He has a mechanical mind and a pecuniary mind, and from our general knowledge of the farmers we know that they are not bound to either interest. I think we can see quite plain evidence that if you get the farming class to bear on this class struggle they are going to decide it, not on the basis of class interest but on the basis of a just award. It is a very significant fact that, in the great trial recently carried on in Idaho, they had a jury of twelve farmers to try the most critical outcome of a class struggle in this country, and that body of farmers, who, I judge from his analysis, would belong to the pecuniary class, had their doubts of the guilt of one class. They considered it was a persecution of one class by the other. I could point out other cases in Ohio and other states where a jury of farmers decided in favor of the employers. The general movement of the farming class in this country seems to be that of a mixed psychology. They decide one way or the other, according to the way in which the case is put to them.

The great two-thirds of the population have not figured it out. On account of the nature of their work, the industries in which they are engaged, their relations one to another, they are not tied up to any one class at any time, or they do not think in any one way along class lines. It seems to me that they are really the great jury which is going to decide the case.

I should certainly agree that if there were but two classes in this country, there would be a class struggle. I do not think it is possible for the employing and employed classes to see alike. Class struggle is inevitable if the socialists can show that there is a division of the country into simply two classes. But it seems to me that the protection against this is the fact that these questions do not have to be settled this year or next year; that when one class is suffering the people will come to its aid; the suffering there will cease. Gradually, back and forth, the different elements of the struggling classes will have their grievances mitigated somewhat, and in the gradual appeal back and forth to this great jury of the people, grievances which cause the class struggle will be gradually eliminated, providing we have the other conditions of direct action of which I have spoken.

The trouble about sociology is that if you get into it you are called upon to prophesy, and it is a difficult thing to prophesy. I am trying to answer the question put to me whether class struggle is inevitable and I have to put so many "if's" around it that even Miss Addams, who agrees with me, has fault to find with some of the things I say.

And as to the women, it is too big a prophecy to take them into account at this stage of the game. The one state in this union where women have longest voted is the one where the most intense class struggle has occurred in the last two or three years. That is Colorado. I do not say that that is because the women vote, nor do I see that it proves that women will solve the class struggle. Women have class interests in much the same way that their husbands and sons and fathers have. They are a part of the great community; a class that, while it is based on the industry that the head of the family follows, has its roots in the welfare and the feelings of the family that he supports, and their interests are tied up together. They feel alike, and in any great strike or class conflict the women are the most strenuous fighters. I cannot see that it would make a great difference if we should include the women, and for immediate practical purposes, to keep as far out of the range of prophecy as possible, I tried to limit my discussion to the voting population.